



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/026,117	12/21/2001	Ping-Chuan Wang	FIS9-2001-0311US1	4950

32074 7590 10/04/2002

INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION
DEPT. 18G
BLDG. 300-482
2070 ROUTE 52
HOPEWELL JUNCTION, NY 12533

EXAMINER

SOWARD, IDA M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2822

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/026,117

Applicant(s)

WANG ET AL.

Examiner

Ida M Soward

Art Unit

2822

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2822

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to the application filed December 21, 2001.

Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: "**the**" should have been a in line 11. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2822

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saran (US 6,232,662 B1) in view of Cave et al. (US 6,313,024 B1).

Saran teaches a reinforced semiconductor interconnect structure, comprising: a first metal interconnect disposed in a first material **43a**, the first metal interconnect having a line portion **308** and at least one via portion **42**, an anode section **44** and a cathode section **43**, the via portion of the first metal interconnect located in the anode section, the line portion of the first metal interconnect having a top, bottom and terminus side, wherein at least part of the bottom side of the line portion of the first metal interconnect in contact with the first dielectric **309**; a first reinforcement **41** disposed in the first material, the first reinforcement in contact with at least the bottom side of the first metal interconnect, the first reinforcement comprising a second material, the second material being electrically conductive; and wherein the second material has a greater mechanical rigidity than the first material (Figures 3-4, cols. 8-9, lines 26-67 and 1-41) and a reinforcement **31b** being at most 50% of the length of the metal interconnect **31** (Figure 3). However, Saran fails to teach a first reinforcement being electrically nonconductive. Cave et al. teach a first reinforcement **24** being electrically nonconductive (Figure 8, cols. 7-8, lines 19-67 and 1-43). Cave et al. further teach a low dielectric constant of 3.6 which is in the range of at most about 4.3 (col. 2, lines 28-35). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the reinforced semiconductor interconnect

structure of Saran with the electrically nonconductive reinforcement of Cave et al. to improve device yield.

Claims 3, 6-10, 12-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saran (US 6,232,662 B1) and Cave et al. (US 6,313,024 B1) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Wong (US 2002/0132468 A1).

Saran and Cave et al. teach all mentioned in the rejection above. Saran further teaches second **31** and third **32** metal interconnects, each disposed in a mechanically compliant dielectric, having a line portion (having a top and bottom), a via portion, an anode section, a cathode section, first & second reinforcements **41** (Figures 3-4) and a reinforcement **32b** being at most 50% of the length of the metal interconnect **32** (Figure 3). Cave et al. further teach a first **24**, second **32**, third **36**, fourth **44** and fifth **48** material being substantially the same such as parylene, silicon oxide or the like (Figure 7, col. 5, lines 44-64). However, Saran and Cave et al. fail to teach via portions of metal interconnect in electrical communication with the line portions of other metal interconnections. Wong teaches via portions of metal interconnect **106** in electrical communication with the line portion **204** of another metal interconnection **206** (Figure 10, page 4, paragraph [0047]). Wong further teach a first reinforcement in contact with via portion in an anode section of the second metal interconnect **206** and the top of the line portion **104** of the first interconnect **106**, wherein the first reinforcement being positioned in the dielectric **110** between the first and second interconnects (Figure 10) and a high dielectric constant (page 2, paragraph [0029]). Therefore, it would have

Art Unit: 2822

been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the reinforced semiconductor interconnect structure of Saran and the electrically nonconductive reinforcement of Cave et al. with the electrical communication of Wong to reduce power dissipation.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following patents are cited to further show the state of the art with respects to a reinforced interconnect structure:

Chisholm et al. (US 2002/0025417 A1)

Goto et al. (5,569,569)

Inoue et al. (US 2002/0090814 A1)

Traskos et al. (5,309,629).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ida M Soward whose telephone number is 703-305-3308. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, 6:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl Whitehead, Jr. can be reached on 703-308-4940. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9318 for regular communications and 703-872-9319 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2822

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

ims

September 27, 2002


CARL WHITEHEAD, JR.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800